

## REMARKS

Claims 1-8 are currently pending in the present application.

Support of amendments in Claims 5 and 8 can be found on page 9, lines 1-8 of the specification.

### Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Scully et al.* (US 4,831,552). Applicants respectfully traverse such rejection insofar as it might apply to the claims as amended herein.

Amended Claim 1 (and similarly Claim 5) now recites a step of "informing said first meeting scheduler that said first meeting has been overridden." On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that *Scully* does not disclose the claimed informing step. However, the Examiner asserts col. 22, lines 64-68 of *Scully* suggest that the calendar owner is shown a response screen for a request to attend a meeting. The Examiner then concludes that "one skilled in the art would recognize that the scheduler of the first meeting would be notified that the lower priority meeting has been overridden." Col. 22, lines 64-68 states

It should be understood that a response screen showing the meeting details may be shown to the calendar owner as the result receiving a request to attend a meeting. In this case the calendar owner would select the proper response.

It is clear from the above-mentioned passage that *Scully* does not teach or suggest that the first meeting has been overridden, and that the first meeting scheduler will be informed the first meeting scheduler after the first meeting schedule has been overridden. The fact that a response screen being shown to the calendar owner has nothing to do with the claimed informing step in which the calendar owner (or an attendee) is not required to act. Because the claimed invention includes novel features that are not taught or suggested by *Scully*, the § 103 rejection is believed to be overcome.

### CONCLUSION

Claims 1-8 are currently pending in the present application. For the reasons stated above, Applicants believe that independent Claims 1 and 5 along with their respective dependent claims are in condition for allowance. The remaining prior art cited by the Examiner but not relied upon has been reviewed and is not believed to show or suggest the claimed invention.

No fee or extension of time is believed to be necessary; however, in the event that any fee or extension of time is required for the prosecution of this application, please charge it against IBM Deposit Account No. **09-0465**.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Antony P. Ng  
*Registration No. 43,427*  
BRACEWELL & PATTERSON, LLP  
P.O. Box 969  
Austin, Texas 78767-0969  
(512) 472-7800

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS